

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 5 were amended. Accordingly, claims 1-9 remain at issue.

**I.      Objection To Claims**

Claims 1 and 5 were objected to because of an informality. Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' amendment to claims 1 and 5 obviates this objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

**II.     35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,130,804). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 5 has been amended to specify that a seal adhered to the sensor package is placed within the opening of the circuit board. Tamura et al. does not disclose or suggest this limitation. Thus, claim 5 is allowable over Tamura et al., and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**III.    35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,130,804) in view of Mogamiya (U.S. Publication No. 20010007475). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,130,804) in view of Mogamiya (U.S. Publication No. 20010007475) and further in view of Ackland et al. (Non-Patent Literature). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,130,804) in view of Mogamiya (U.S. Publication No. 20010007475) and further in

view of Tullis (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,243). Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,130,804) in view of Ackland et al. (Non-Patent Literature). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,130,804) in view of Tullis (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,243). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed above, Tamura et al. does not disclose or suggest that a seal adhered to the sensor package is placed within the opening of the circuit board, as required by claims 1 and claim 5. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Tamura et al. with the teachings of Mogamiya, Ackland et al. and Tullis to derive claims 1-4 or claims 6-9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 15, 2006

By:   
Marina N. Saito  
Registration No. 42,121  
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000